

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-19 remain pending in the application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 9 and 14 are amended.

A telephone interview was held on December 16, 2005 between Examiner Borissov and Applicants' representative. A summary of the interview is provided below.

On page 2 of the final Office Action, independent claims 1, 9 and 14, along with various dependent claims, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,728,748 (Mangipudi et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,374,300 (Masters). On page 8 of the Office Action, dependent claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Mangipudi et al. patent in view of the Masters patent, and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,956,752 (Mathews). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

As discussed during the interview, Applicants have disclosed data service system and method that include a request processor that schedules requests from external clients for transactions to be serviced by the server system based on classification contained in a classification tag of those requests having such a tag and a default classification mechanism for those requests not having an associated classification tag. For example, an application system is coupled to the server system, which includes an application engine that performs a requested transaction scheduled by the server system and provides an associated transaction response to the server system for return to the requesting external client; a business rule engine that stores business rules regarding classification of various transactions, and uses

the business rules to analyze at least some of the transaction responses; and a tag generator that generates a classification tag for a particular transaction in a session based on the analysis of its associated transaction response by the business rule engine (e.g., page 9, lines 9-21).

The classification of access or user requests can be generated in the application system to assign a classification per transaction based on a priority-based back-end classification (e.g., page 15, lines 6-13). The application system 35 is considered to be in the best position to indicate which of the user requests should be assigned a high priority because application system 35 handles the actual transaction requested. In one exemplary embodiment, the request classification function is performed to assign a classification per transaction by the application system 35 as a back-end classification, and not the request processor 32 (e.g., specification page 15, lines 15-24).

The foregoing features are broadly encompassed by claim 1, which recites, among other features, a data service system that includes a request processor that schedules requests from external clients for transactions to be serviced by a server system based on classification contained in a classification tag of those requests having such a tag and a default classification mechanism for those requests not having an associated classification tag, wherein a classification tag is generated in the application system to assign a classification per transaction based on a priority-based back-end classification. Claims 9 and 14 recite similar features.

As discussed during the interview, the Mangipudi et al. patent discloses a method and apparatus for policy based class of service management. The Mangipudi et al. patent discloses that the class of service is implemented as a

function of the user (col. 9, lines 58-59; Fig. 4), but does not teach or suggest a tag-based classification associated with a request. The Mangipudi et al. patent discloses a scheme for load balancing among service hosts in a cluster (e.g., col. 6, lines 313-15), but does not teach or suggest a classification tag being generated in an application system to assign a classification per transaction based on a priority-based back-end classification. Accordingly, the Mangipudi et al. patent does not teach or suggest a data service system that includes a request processor that schedules requests from external clients for transactions to be serviced by a server system based on classification contained in a classification tag of those requests having such a tag and a default classification mechanism for those requests not having an associated classification tag, wherein a classification tag is generated in the application system to assign a classification per transaction based on a priority-based back-end classification.

As discussed during the interview, the Masters patent does not cure the deficiencies of the Mangipudi et al. patent. The Masters patent was cited for its disclosure of a cookie information insertable in an HTTP response that uniquely identifies a client so that when a client's subsequent HTTP request is compared to a table, the HTTP request will be routed to a previously selected destination associated with the client (abstract). The cookie information identifies the client (e.g., col. 4, lines 3-4), but the Masters patent does not teach or suggest that a classification tag is generated in an application system to assign a classification per transaction based on a priority-based back-end classification.

As discussed during the interview, the Mathews patent does not cure the deficiencies of the Mangipudi et al. and Masters patents. The Mathews patent was

cited for its disclosure of a look up table for storing a relationship mapping between a client's IP address and the IP address of a server (col. 1, lines 12-19), but the Mathews patent does not teach or suggest a data service system that includes a request processor that schedules requests from external clients for transactions to be serviced by a server system based on classification contained in a classification tag of those requests having such a tag and a default classification mechanism for those requests not having an associated classification tag, wherein a classification tag is generated in the application system to assign a classification per transaction based on a priority-based back-end classification.

Even if combined, the Mangipudi et al., Masters and Mathews patents lack at least the recited feature of a classification tag being generated in the application system to assign a classification per transaction based on a priority-based back-end classification. Accordingly, the Mangipudi et al., Masters and Mathews patents, considered individually or in combination, fail to teach or recite features recited in Applicants' claim 1.

All remaining claims depend from the aforementioned independent claims and recite additional advantageous features which further distinguish over the documents relied upon by the Examiner.

All objections and rejections raised in the Office Action having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and a Notice of Allowance is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL PC



Date: December 29, 2005

By: _____

Ry No. 48,360
Patrick C. Keane
Registration No. 32,858

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620